

REMARKS

Claims 25-65 remain in the present application. Claims 1-24 are cancelled herein. Claims 25-65 are added herein. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendments. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

Examiner Interview Summary

A telephonic Examiner Interview was conducted on June 24, 2009 between Examiner Charles Hicks and Applicants' representative Bryan M. Failing. It was agreed during the Examiner Interview on June 24, 2009 that the cited references of record fail to teach or suggest the combination of elements including "wherein said first display screen further comprises a first black matrix with a first pattern" and "wherein said second display screen further comprises a second black matrix with a second pattern" as recited in independent Claim 38. It was also agreed during the Examiner Interview on June 24, 2009 that the cited references of record fail to teach or suggest the combination of elements including "wherein said first display screen utilizes a first display technology" and "wherein said second display screen utilizes a second display technology" as recited in independent Claim 52. Applicants thank the Examiner for conducting the interview.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-2, 7-8, 11, 15-16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by United States Patent Number 6,906,762 to Witehira et al. (referred to herein as “Witehira”). Claims 1-2, 7-8, 11, 15-16 and 19 are cancelled herein, and thus, Applicants respectfully submit that a discussion of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of Claims 1-2, 7-8, 11, 15-16 and 19 is moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 3, 9-10, 17-18 and 20-24

Claims 3, 9-10, 17-18 and 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Witehira in view of United States Patent Number 6,573,961 to Jiang et al. (referred to herein as “Jiang”). Claims 3, 9-10, 17-18 and 20-24 are cancelled herein, and thus, Applicants respectfully submits that a discussion of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claims 3, 9-10, 17-18 and 20-24 is moot.

Claims 4-5

Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Witehira in view of United States Patent Number 7,072,095 to Liang et al. (referred to herein as “Liang ‘095”). Claims 4-5 are cancelled herein, and thus, Applicants respectfully submit that a discussion of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claims 4-5 is moot.

Claim 6

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Witehira in view of United States Patent Number 7,205,355 to Liang et al. (referred to herein as “Liang ‘355”). Claim 6 is cancelled herein, and thus, Applicants respectfully submit that a discussion of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claim 6 is moot.

Claims 12-13

Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Witehira in view of Jiang and further in view of Liang ‘095. Claims 12-13 are cancelled herein, and thus, Applicants respectfully submit that a discussion of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claims 12-13 is moot.

Claim 14

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Witehira in view of Liang ‘355. Claim 14 is cancelled herein, and thus, Applicants respectfully submit that a discussion of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claim 14 is moot.

Claims 25-37

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 25 which recites a multi-component display comprising (emphasis added):

a first display screen comprising a first plurality of pixels, wherein said first display screen is operable to display a first image using said first plurality of pixels, and wherein said first plurality of pixels comprises a first plurality of sub-pixels arranged in a first pattern; and

a second display screen comprising a second plurality of pixels, wherein said second display screen is operable to display a second image using said second plurality of pixels, wherein said second display screen overlaps said first display screen, and wherein said second plurality of pixels comprises a second plurality of sub-pixels arranged in a second pattern.

Claims 26-37 depend from independent Claim 25 and recite further elements of the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that Jiang fails to teach or suggest the combination of elements including “wherein said first plurality of pixels comprises a first plurality of sub-pixels arranged in a first pattern” and “wherein said second plurality of pixels comprises a second plurality of sub-pixels arranged in a second pattern” as recited in independent Claim 25. As described in the present application, a first display screen includes a first plurality of pixels, where the first plurality of pixels includes a first plurality of sub-pixels arranged in a first pattern. A second display screen includes a second plurality of pixels, where the second plurality of pixels includes a second plurality of sub-pixels arranged in a second pattern. In this manner, the sub-pixel pattern of each display screen is different.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Jiang to teach a color filter with two layers. Although page 6 of the rejection suggests that each of the two layers of the color filter is placed in a different display screen, Jiang teaches that the two layers are laminated together (Figure 16A; col. 49, lines 4-5). As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the laminated, two-layer color filter is not used in multiple display screens as suggested by the rejection. Accordingly, Applicants reiterate that Jiang fails to teach or suggest the

combination of elements including “wherein said first plurality of pixels comprises a first plurality of sub-pixels arranged in a first pattern” and “wherein said second plurality of pixels comprises a second plurality of sub-pixels arranged in a second pattern” as recited in independent Claim 25.

Applicants respectfully submit that the other cited references of record, either alone or in combination with Jiang, fail to cure the deficiencies of Jiang discussed herein. More specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that the other cited references of record, either alone or in combination with Jiang, also fail to teach or suggest the combination of elements including “wherein said first plurality of pixels comprises a first plurality of sub-pixels arranged in a first pattern” and “wherein said second plurality of pixels comprises a second plurality of sub-pixels arranged in a second pattern” as recited in independent Claim 25.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 25 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the cited references of record. Since Claims 26-37 recite further elements of the invention claimed in independent Claim 25, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 26-37 are also neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the cited references of record. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 25-37 are allowable.

Claims 38-65

It was agreed during the Examiner Interview on June 24, 2009 that the cited references of record fail to teach or suggest the combination of elements

including “wherein said first display screen further comprises a first black matrix with a first pattern” and “wherein said second display screen further comprises a second black matrix with a second pattern” as recited in independent Claim 38. It was also agreed during the Examiner Interview on June 24, 2009 that the cited references of record fail to teach or suggest the combination of elements including “wherein said first display screen utilizes a first display technology” and “wherein said second display screen utilizes a second display technology” as recited in independent Claim 52. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 38 and 52 overcome the cited references of record. Since Claims 39-51 and 53-65 recite further elements of the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 39-51 and 53-65 are also neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the cited references of record. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 38-65 are allowable.

General Remarks

The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or dependent claims are not further discussed as the above-discussed limitations are believed to be sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art of record. However, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to respond to one or more of the Examiner’s rejections in subsequent amendments should conditions arise warranting such responses.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 25-65 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 7 / 29 / 2009

/BMF/

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060